

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-20. By this response, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 13-15, 18, and 20 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled. The Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

The information disclosure statement submitted on 5/20/2005 was not considered for failure to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strobel et al., U.S. Pat. No. 7,050, 844 B2 (“Strobel”).

The Applicant first turns to the information disclosure statement submitted on 5/23/2005 not being considered for failure to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. The Office Action at page 2 identifies publication numbers “2002/172328” and “2003/052879” as incorrect. The Applicant notes that a leading zero was omitted from each of the two publication numbers, and apologizes for the typographical error, which was made without deceptive intent. The Applicant will submit a supplemental information disclosure statement with the publication numbers in the proper format for consideration.

The Applicant now turns to the amendment of claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 13-15, 18, and 20 and the cancellation of claim 4. Independent claims, 1, 10, and 18 have been amended to receive the creation of “an animation by scrolling” through images. Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 8 have been amended to conform to amendments to claims from which they depend. In addition, claims 2 and 20 have been amended to clarify what is being claimed. Claims 13-15 have been amended

to correct typographical errors. The Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

With respect to claim 4, this claim has been cancelled because it recited subject matter similar to that now incorporated in independent claim 1 from which it depended. The Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue subject matter within the scope of the cancelled claim.

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strobel. The Applicant respectfully submits that Strobel does not teach or suggest the entirety of the limitations recited in the pending claims for at least the reasons discussed below.

As stated beginning at col. 1, line 11, Strobel relates to “automatically detecting the three-dimensional position of a medical examination instrument introduced into a body region.” More particularly, Strobel discusses “using a device for registering radiation image having at least one C-arm system.”

As illustrated in Figure 1 and discussed beginning at col. 5, line 63, “a number of two-dimensional angiography projection images [are] registered” using the C-arm system. The two-dimensional images are used for “reconstruction of the three-dimensional volume of the examination region.” That is, a three-dimensional volume is determined by registering two or more of the acquired two-dimensional images. The location of a point representing, for example, an instrument such as a catheter, is then determined. Finally, “the reconstructed 3D volume ... as well as the identified point that describes the position of the catheter tip [is] displayed.” As stated at col. 6, lines 22-25, this process of registration of two projection images, the determination of the instrument position, and the display of the reconstructed 3D volume is

repeated “resulting in a continuous acquisition of the movement of the catheter in the vessel.” Thus, Strobel discusses the registration of two or more images to construct a three-dimensional volume which is displayed along with a determined instrument position.

Strobel does not teach scrolling through a set of images to create an animation. Rather, as discussed above, Strobel teaches the display of a three-dimensional volume reconstructed from two or more registered two-dimensional images.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite the creation of an “animation by scrolling” through a set of images. As discussed above, Strobel does not teach scrolling through a set of images to create an animation. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 10 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

With respect to claims 18-20, the Applicant notes that the Office Action does not appear to have addressed these claims. However, independent claim 18 has been amended to recite the creation of an animation by scrolling a series of images, similar to claims 1 and 10, discussed above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 18 should be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2-3 & 5-9; 11-17; and 19-20 depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 18, respectively. The Applicant respectfully submits that because claims 1, 10, and 18 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above, claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-17, and 19-20 should also be allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account of GTC, Account No. 070845.

Respectfully submitted,

June 19, 2007

/Adam J. Faier/
Adam J. Faier
Reg. No. 56,898

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
34th Floor
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100